United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.18

General Assembly Official Records

First Committee

18th Meeting

Friday, 10 November 1995, 3 p.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: This afternoon the Committee will proceed to the next phase of its work, namely, action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items, including agenda item 79, "Rationalization of the work and reform of the agenda of the First Committee".

Before proceeding further, I call upon the Secretary of the Committee to make a statement.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I should like to remind delegations of the procedure involved in taking action on draft resolutions and decisions.

Where action on each cluster of draft resolutions is concerned, delegations will first have an opportunity to introduce draft resolutions with regard to any particular cluster. I would point out that any names to be inscribed on the list of speakers, whether for the purpose of introducing a draft resolution or of statements, should be given to my colleague on the rostrum with me and it will be noted accordingly.

Once the process of introducing draft resolutions has been concluded, delegations wishing to make statements other than in explanation of their positions or votes on the draft resolutions in a particular cluster will be called upon. Subsequently, delegations will have an opportunity to explain their positions or votes before action is taken on any or all draft resolutions contained in a particular cluster.

After the Committee has taken a decision on the draft resolutions in a given cluster, delegations wishing to explain their position or vote after the voting on any or all draft resolutions will be called upon to do so. In this connection I should point out that a question was raised yesterday by the representative of India, to which the Chairman has already replied. That position stands.

I would urge delegations, on behalf of the Chairman, to make consolidated statements on the draft resolutions in a particular cluster when making statements or explanations of vote, bearing in mind the proviso to which I have just referred.

In order to avoid any misunderstanding, I would also urge members of the Committee who wish to request a recorded vote on any particular draft resolution to inform the Secretariat of their intention in advance and as early as possible prior to the Committee's taking action on any individual cluster.

The Chairman: I should inform delegations at this juncture that there have been some changes made in the draft resolutions to be considered this afternoon. At this meeting, the Committee will take a decision on draft resolutions in the following clusters:

In cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.5/Rev.1, L.6 and L.47;

95-86612 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

In cluster 2: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.22;

In cluster 7: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.4;

In cluster 8: draft decision A/C.1/50/L.2 and draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.11, L.16 and L.26;

In cluster 10: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1.

Before proceeding, I call once again upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that Afghanistan has become a co-sponsor of the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/50/L.3, L.7, L.10, L.11, L.14, L.15, L.16, L.19 and L.31.

In addition, the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions:

A/C.1/50/L.15: Estonia;

A/C.1/50/L.16: Nigeria;

A/C.1/50/L.28: Peru;

A/C.1/50/L.32: Papua New Guinea and Peru;

A/C.1/50/L.39: Philippines;

A/C.1/50/L.48: Philippines;

A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1: Albania and Belarus;

A/C.1/50/L.11: Cape Verde, Jamaica, Kazakstan and Papua New Guinea;

A/C.1/50/L.27: Bangladesh;

A/C.1/50/L.47: Islamic Republic of Iran;

A/C.1/50/L.5: Bangladesh; and

A/C.1/50/L.36: Turkey.

The Chairman: I have just been informed that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.32, in cluster 1, can be voted upon this afternoon. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that delegations agree.

It was so decided.

The Chairman: Before the Committee proceeds to take action on the draft resolutions in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations that wish to introduce draft resolutions.

I now call upon the representative of Myanmar, who wishes to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear disarmament", in document A/C.1/50/L.46, on behalf of the following countries: Algeria, Bangladesh, Colombia, Cuba, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Malaysia, the Marshall Islands, Mexico, Mongolia, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Tanzania, Thailand, Viet Nam, Zimbabwe, and my own delegation, Myanmar.

The year 1995 is a landmark not only in the history of the United Nations but also in the history of nuclear arms limitation and disarmament. It marks the fiftieth anniversary of the use of nuclear weapons and the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). It also witnessed the momentous decision by the NPT Review and Extension Conference to extend the Treaty indefinitely, as well as its decision on Principles and Objectives, which contained the reaffirmation by the nuclear-weapon States of their commitment to pursue in good faith negotiations on effective measures for nuclear disarmament and the decision on the strengthening of the review process for the Treaty. It is only fitting that in this landmark year the First Committee and the General Assembly will adopt this milestone draft resolution on nuclear disarmament.

Mankind has lived under the nuclear threat for the past 50 years. We must now act to rid the world of this horrible threat. We believe that the only truly effective way to remove the nuclear threat completely is by the total elimination of these weapons. Our vision is no less than a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Myanmar is a State Party to the NPT and a strong supporter of the Treaty. However, the cause of nuclear disarmament cannot and must not be subordinated to the measure of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Such a selective and unbalanced approach will not work in the long term.

Nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation are two sides of the same coin. We believe that these two measures must go hand in hand. We cannot conceive of an effective

regime of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons without effective measures for nuclear disarmament.

The pursuit of the goal of the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons while showing reluctance to proceed with the process of nuclear disarmament betrays inconsistency in one's own nuclear policy. To quote a Myanmar saying, such a policy is like holding a flaming torch in one hand and a running-water hose in the other. Such a policy cannot and will not work in the long term.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46 is a genuine nuclear-disarmament resolution, one that addresses the question of nuclear disarmament in a substantive and comprehensive manner.

In operative paragraph 2 the General Assembly would recognize that there is a genuine need to de-emphasize the role of nuclear weapons, and to review and revise the nuclear doctrines accordingly.

In operative paragraph 3 the nuclear-weapon States would be urged to stop immediately the qualitative improvement, development, stockpiling and production of nuclear warheads and their delivery systems.

In operative paragraph 4 the nuclear-weapon States would be called upon to undertake step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat and a phased programme of progressive and balanced deep reductions of nuclear weapons, and to carry out effective nuclear disarmament measures with a view to the total elimination of these weapons within a time-bound framework.

In operative paragraph 5 the General Assembly would call upon the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to commence negotiations early in 1996 on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

In short, the draft resolution focuses squarely on the central issue of nuclear disarmament and underlines the role of the Conference on Disarmament in this regard as the single multilateral negotiating forum in the field of disarmament.

The draft resolution is submitted pursuant to the decision of the summit meeting of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held only three weeks ago at Cartagena. It reflects the aspiration of the international community to create a nuclear-weapon-free world and the positions and recommendations on nuclear disarmament contained in the Final Declaration of the Cartagena summit meeting.

I therefore call upon the members of the First Committee to give overwhelming support to this draft resolution. I urge the delegations of non-nuclear-weapon States to vote in favour of the draft resolution and to become sponsors of it as well.

The Chairman: I call now on representatives wishing to make statements, other than in explanation of position, on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. Jusuf (Indonesia): My delegation wishes to make some observations on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46, introduced just now by the representative of Myanmar and entitled "Nuclear disarmament". As members know, the General Assembly has been seized of the issue of nuclear disarmament since the advent of the atomic age. Over the years the Assembly has formulated the principles that should govern the process and defined the issues involved in it. None the less, no appreciable progress was made during the era of ideological and military confrontation.

In a world where scenarios of deterrence have become irrelevant, and where strategic premises that once guided thinking on nuclear arms limitation and disarmament have lost their validity, there can be no rationale for nuclear weapons, which should be phased out with a view to their ultimate elimination. It is hoped that, with further success in the critical area of reducing and eliminating nuclear armaments, the qualitative growth of these weapons will soon be curbed. In the post-cold-war era, new attitudes and approaches have emerged, bringing fresh impetus to the long-dormant disarmament scene.

The commitment to the need to exercise restraint in the testing of nuclear weapons and to conclude a comprehensive test-ban treaty no later than 1996 has been expressed by all nuclear-weapon States. International endeavours to achieve the goal of nuclear disarmament under multilateral auspices, which today coincide with the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the United Nations, have thus gained a momentum which should not be lost.

Such endeavours as those called for in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46 should be pursued under the auspices of the Conference on Disarmament, with a negotiating mandate.

In our view, this draft resolution merits serious consideration by the Committee.

Ms. Ghose (India): I express the support of my delegation for the draft resolution just introduced by the delegation of Myanmar. After the introduction given by the lead sponsor and the words spoken by the previous speaker, I have only a few words to add. It is the feeling of our delegation that the time is right today to face the issue of nuclear disarmament squarely. We do not feel that we should permit this window of opportunity to close on us; it may not open again.

We recognize that some steps are indeed being taken to take advantage of this position by some nuclear-weapon States. However, it is our feeling that this is not enough. Moreover, we feel that we, as non-nuclear-weapon States, also have a stake in nuclear disarmament: it is our security we are thinking about.

Secondly, in our view, and as has been accepted by the international community, the Conference on Disarmament is the only multilateral body for negotiating disarmament agreements. We would like very much for the Conference on Disarmament to begin occupying itself seriously with the issue of nuclear disarmament. As all of us are aware, a major disarmament treaty is under negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament. There is an expectation that work on other disarmament treaties will also be undertaken. Now, these treaties by themselves will not be meaningful to the cause of international peace and security unless, simultaneously, the Conference on Disarmament were able at least to start parallel negotiations on nuclear disarmament. We are aware of the very heavy schedule in the Conference on Disarmament next year, but the subject is of great importance: not only was this need recognized by Heads of State or Government of non-aligned Countries at Cartagena, but it is also recognized in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46.

I therefore join earlier speakers in expressing the hope that the draft resolution will commend itself to the Committee and command the widest possible support.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I echo the support voiced by other speakers for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46 under agenda item 70, "General and complete disarmament". According to this draft resolution, the General Assembly would reaffirm the commitment of the international community to the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons and the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free world. It also recognizes that the end of the cold war and other recent developments have brought about favourable conditions, in which all nuclear-weapon States should be able to adopt effective measures of nuclear disarmament with a view to the total elimination of these weapons within a time-bound framework.

For those reasons, and because the text essentially reflects agreements achieved in this area at the recent meeting of Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries, held at Cartagena, my delegation is an enthusiastic sponsor of the draft resolution and urges other non-nuclear-weapon States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, as well as non-nuclear-weapon States outside the Movement, to support it.

Mr. Attia (Egypt): It gives me great pleasure to address the Committee today on the issue of general and complete disarmament, as reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", which is sponsored by Egypt and other members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries.

The end of the cold war has not reduced the threat posed by nuclear weapons. As a matter of fact, it has challenged the international community as a whole to take collective action towards the goal of creating a nuclear-weapon-free world. Facing this challenge requires revising the conceptual framework inherited from the cold-war era while taking gradual steps towards nuclear disarmament, as stipulated in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). One overriding principle of the NPT is that the spread of nuclear weapons undermines international peace and security. Article VI of the Treaty underscores the obligation of nuclear States

> "to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament".

The completion of a comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty is but one step in this gradual process. Unrelenting international efforts should continue in this regard with a view to the total elimination of these weapons within a time-bound framework. To date, only small steps have been taken to realize that goal. The NPT still lacks universality, a fact which permits the shadow of nuclear war to loom over the world scene. It should be noted that, although quantitative reductions have been made by some nuclear Powers, no corresponding measures have been taken to implement qualitative limitations. Also, some States still undertake advanced nuclear programmes in the absence of international safeguards. Therefore, the use or threat of use

of nuclear weapons should be prohibited through international, legally binding instruments, to ensure the security of non-nuclear States.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46 thus attempts to mitigate the conceptual and security gap between the nuclear "haves" and the nuclear "have-nots", by addressing the security concerns of the non-nuclear States. In paragraphs 1 and 2 there is recognition of the fact that the end of the cold war provides a favourable environment for disarmament, an opportunity that should be seized to build effective nuclear disarmament measures within a time-bound framework, and that there is a genuine need to de-emphasize the role of nuclear weapons and to review and revise nuclear doctrines accordingly and to renounce them.

Paragraphs 3 and 4 address the need to stop the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems, as well as the urgent need for nuclear States to undertake phased programmes to reduce their arsenals of nuclear weapons with a view to the total elimination of these weapons within a time-bound framework.

This is seen, in paragraphs 5 and 6, as being possible only through commencing negotiations early in 1996 through an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to be established by the Conference on Disarmament.

Let me stress how vital the issue at hand is. This issue certainly needs close scrutiny and follow-up to benefit from the momentum created by the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the NPT, which was clearly reflected in the Cartagena summit Final Document of the Non-Aligned Movement. Let me also note that no resolution concerning general and complete disarmament, and in particular nuclear disarmament, can be effective without a well defined, time-bound programme.

It is ironic that scientific development is becoming a source of threat to mankind, inasmuch as it is an element for progress. While the agrarian age gave us the hoe and the sword, the industrial and technological ages gave us mass production as well as mass destruction. Saving humanity from such treacherous results requires sincere collective action to eliminate the potential danger of nuclear war and to realize peace and stability.

It is to that end that we urge all Member States to give full support to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I too wish to express my gratitude and support for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46, introduced today by the delegation of Myanmar. Members will recall that last year a substantial group of countries, including my own, submitted a draft resolution entitled "Step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat", which enjoyed broad support in the First Committee and in the General Assembly, where it was adopted as resolution 49/75 E. It was an extremely modest, but most important, proposal on this topic.

Resolution 49/75 E was aimed at providing the international community with machinery that would enable all States, especially nuclear-weapon States, to embark in an orderly and rational fashion on the path to a step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat, working within the Conference on Disarmament and in a time-bound framework.

The fundamental purposes and elements of resolution 49/75 E are echoed in the draft resolution just introduced by Myanmar on behalf of all the sponsors. Hence, in the view of my delegation, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46 would replace resolution 49/75 E, the so-called step-by-step resolution. My delegation appeals to the more than 100 delegations that supported last year's resolution to support the draft resolution introduced today by Myanmar, of which my delegation is a sponsor.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): My delegation has already had an opportunity to express its full support for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46, which has just been introduced by the representative of Myanmar and of which my delegation is a sponsor. I wish to take this opportunity to underline that we believe that this is a historic initiative, one which would enable the international community to launch a truly international process of nuclear disarmament. Nuclear weapons continue to pose a threat to mankind, even though they have been reduced. The qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons continues, and the threat of a nuclear holocaust could arise again if international relations were to deteriorate.

For all these reasons, we hope that the consensus that was achieved at the summit meeting of non-aligned countries at Cartagena to promote a process of phased nuclear disarmament within a time-bound framework will be accepted by all the nuclear-weapon States and the entire international community and that the Conference on Disarmament will establish an ad hoc committee, on a priority basis in 1996, to commence negotiations for such

a programme of nuclear disarmament within a time-bound framework.

I wish to recall that, as far back as 1978, the General Assembly was able to adopt in a consensus document the proposition that nuclear weapons pose the greatest danger to mankind and to the survival of civilization. It is essential to halt and reverse the nuclear-arms race in all its aspects in order to avert the danger of war involving nuclear weapons. The ultimate goal in this context is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

Today, we must revive our commitment to that goal. Today we hope that the international community will come together to make a determined start for the elimination of this worst threat to the survival of mankind that we have ever known in history.

Mr. Rivero Rosario (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has become a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", which was introduced just now by the delegation of Myanmar.

We have done so because we feel that the text embodies some very timely and extremely important ideas. Indeed, with the end of the cold war and the new climate in international relations, the time is ripe for taking practical measures on nuclear disarmament with a view to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, which even today present a challenge to mankind. These ideas include the need to reduce the significance of the role of nuclear weapons and to control existing nuclear weapons to avoid the qualitative improvement, development, stockpiling and production of nuclear warheads and their delivery systems, along with a gradual reduction of the nuclear threat and a phased programme of progressive and balanced deep reductions of nuclear weapons. All of these are aspects of great importance articulated in this draft resolution, which my delegation warmly supports.

The recent Eleventh Summit Conference of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, speaking on behalf of its 113 members, called on the Conference of Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to commence negotiations early in 1996 on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

My delegation hopes that this draft resolution will enjoy the general support of the First Committee and the General Assembly and we urge members to vote in its favour.

Mr. Mohamedifard (Islamic Republic of Iran): I hereby announce our full support for the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament introduced by Myanmar.

The Chairman: I call on those delegations wishing to explain their positions before a decision is taken on all draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

Ms. Ghose (India): It will be no surprise that India has asked to speak on some of the draft resolutions we are now considering under the first cluster. My delegation is a co-sponsor and sponsor of two of the draft resolutions before us. Our view regarding the time-limit on the draft resolution on the convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons has already been stated when we had the honour of introducing it to this Committee a few days ago on behalf of the co-sponsors.

In a sense, of course, the draft resolutions on the nuclear-weapon-free zones are linked to the purport of the draft resolution on the convention and the reasons underlying it. The latter draft resolution stands for global security through the non-use of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon States as against the notional security of specific geographical areas. In our view, a global approach is required for weapons that have a global reach.

Our position on nuclear-weapon-free zones is well known and we have assiduously repeated it every year for almost two decades. None the less, I welcome the opportunity to do so again this year.

It has always been our view that nuclear disarmament is a global issue that can only be resolved globally and addressed through a global approach. The goal of nuclear disarmament leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons cannot be achieved by partial measures. We do not consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as being in accord with this global approach. The global reach of nuclear weapons and their deployment and stationing in different parts of the world render nuclear-weapon-free zones less than effective in promoting global nuclear disarmament and, indeed, international peace and security.

This year, after the nuclear-weapon States have achieved permanency for their possession of nuclear weapons and their reluctance to abjure the use or threat of use of these weapons, we are even less convinced of

nuclear-weapon-free zones as a concept of non-nuclear-weapon Powers renouncing nuclear weapons.

It may be further mentioned that the United Nations endorsed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones only after an appropriate definition of the region based on a correct perception of its geographical extent and taking into account the full range of security concerns of the States of the region. Such zones must, moreover, be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at and with the consent of the States of the region concerned. This view was fully reflected in the consensus paper on regional disarmament prepared by the Disarmament Commission in 1993.

We none the less accept that each State has the right to safeguard its security in the way it deems most appropriate. We will therefore not oppose those draft resolutions on nuclear-weapon-free zones which have been freely and voluntarily arrived at by a group of countries. We are, however, not able to go along with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6, calling for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as it does not fulfil any of the criteria endorsed by the United Nations and lacks consensus. We will therefore vote against this draft resolution and we have already requested a recorded vote on it.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I simply wish to clarify one point with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.5. This draft resolution was redistributed today under the symbol A/C.1/50/L.5/Rev.1 and includes a new seventh preambular paragraph, which reads:

> "*Recalling* that in 1990, 1991 and 1992 the General Conference of the Agency for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean approved and opened for signature a set of amendments to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, with the aim of enabling the full entry into force of that instrument,".

This is not an innovative paragraph. It can be found in last year's resolution and in earlier ones. For some reason, presumably typographical, it was omitted this year. We have now reinserted it and the sponsors commend the draft resolution in its entirety. It has generally been adopted without a vote.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions listed in cluster 1, beginning with the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.5/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I see that the moment of truth has arrived in terms of voting on the draft resolutions. For a moment, I thought there would be a joyous outburst, but I see that there is absolute quiet. I suppose that we are saving our sentiments and emotions for a collective sigh of relief, either on 17 or 20 November, when, we hope, we will conclude all action on all draft resolutions.

Be that as it may, we shall now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.5/Rev.1, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)".

The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 16th meeting, on 8 November 1995, and was sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the First Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take up the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.6.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 14th meeting of the First Committee on 7 November 1995 and is sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The Chairman: I put to the vote draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Latvia, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining:

Algeria, Cuba, Cyprus, Georgia, Indonesia, Israel, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Myanmar, Swaziland, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6 was adopted by 133 votes to 3, with 11 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegations of Gabon, Georgia and the Islamic Republic of Iran advised the Secretariat that they had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.32.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.32, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 15th meeting, on Tuesday, 7 November 1995, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Benin, Brunei Darussalam, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Peru, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania and Venezuela.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.32 was adopted by 95 votes to 4, with 44 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 16th meeting on 8 November 1995 and is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Belize, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Colombia, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Haiti, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malawi, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, the Philippines, Sudan and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Andorra, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Barbados, Belarus, Estonia, Georgia, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Liechtenstein, Malta, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47 was adopted by 95 votes to 26, with 26 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Afghanistan advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft resolution.]

The Chairman: The Committee has thus concluded for today its consideration of draft resolutions in cluster 1.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote.

Mr. Jusuf (Indonesia): My delegation would like to clarify the reasoning behind its abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6. We have consistently maintained that the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. This is fully in accord with paragraphs 33 and 60 of the Final Document adopted by consensus at the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament.

Further, in paragraph 61 of that document the Assembly stated:

"The process of establishing such zones in different parts of the world should be encouraged.... The States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements...". *(S-10/2, para. 61)*

In view of the fact that efforts towards the achievement of an agreement to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia are under way and have yet to be conclusively pursued, my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6.

Mr. Richards (New Zealand): New Zealand abstained this year in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47: "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". New Zealand shares the objective of the sponsors of the draft resolution in seeking to reduce the threat of nuclear war and eventually to eliminate nuclear weapons altogether. It is for this reason that we could not possibly consider opposing the text.

Changes of attitude in the international community towards the role that nuclear weapons play in global security have served to make consideration of their use a much more remote possibility now than even a few years ago. Nevertheless, no magic wand is available to rid the world of the still high number of warheads in existence. It will take years of effort to carry out the necessary work.

We obviously support the path of negotiations, but have real reservations about whether calls at this stage for a draft convention could make a practical contribution and whether, even it were, a United Nations resolution is the right place to be suggesting convention language.

In the end, the only sure guarantee against the use of nuclear weapons is through their elimination by negotiation. We therefore continue to place priority on practical measures that will clearly enhance the process of nuclear disarmament. In our view, the draft resolution on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, which will be adopted later in this session, and the negotiations it encourages is one, most important such measure.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I should like to explain Israel's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6 on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Israel decided to abstain this year in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6 in order to emphasize the principle that regional arrangements, including the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, should originate from within the region through free and direct negotiations which would eventually lead to agreements accepted by all parties involved. Any attempt to impose agreements by using international organizations will be counter-productive and is likely to impede those efforts.

Israel continues, of course, to support the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones tailored to every region according to its own characteristics, freely negotiated by all regional States and including mutual verification regimes. The timing and characteristics of such zones should be agreed upon by all parties involved.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): My delegation would like to make brief explanations of its votes regarding two of the draft resolutions upon which we have just taken action, A/C.1/50/L.6: "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", and A/C.1/50/L.32: "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water".

My delegation attaches great importance to nuclear-non-proliferation initiatives in South Asia. In this regard, and with particular reference to operative paragraph 2, we call on all States in the region to ensure that their policies and actions do not prejudice the objectives of the draft resolution. At the same time, my delegation wishes to note that the United States support for the draft resolution should not be interpreted as a blanket endorsement of nuclear-weapon-free zones, as might be inferred from the second preambular paragraph.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.32: "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water", we have once again voted against the draft resolution on the following grounds: the Conference on Disarmament has been intensively engaged in negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty since January of 1994. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.32 is not helpful in that negotiating process in that it continues to advocate a role for another forum, an amendment conference of States parties to the Treaty, in concluding negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, as if there were no ongoing negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In this regard we note that the operative part of the draft resolution does not even mention that negotiations are well under way and moving into their final phase in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

This is not the way to promote success and a speedy conclusion to the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. An amendment conference of the States parties to the partial test-ban Treaty is not a substitute forum for negotiating a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The United States looks forward to the early conclusion of the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty in the Conference on Disarmament. Indeed, President Clinton has called for conclusion of those negotiations by this coming April.

Mr. Starr (Australia): Australia abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47: "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons". Australia regrets that it was unable to support the draft resolution. While generally supportive of the underlying thrust of the draft resolution, we could not overlook its lack of balance in terms of the absence of any reference to the importance of non-proliferation commitments in the path to nuclear disarmament. The neglect of reference to this essential element, in Australia's view, renders the proposed approach impracticable.

We would, however, like to underline Australia's unequivocal support for the goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons via a systematic process, as made clear most recently in the speech given by the Prime Minister of Australia, Paul Keating, on Australia and a world without nuclear weapons.

We would also like to reiterate our support for the development of a single, binding security assurance of non-use of nuclear weapons by the nuclear-weapon States against non-nuclear-weapon States that are Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) or similar regional arrangements.

Mr. Felicio (Brazil): Brazil would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.6: "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia". My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution, which is consistent with Brazil's position in support of the establishment of such zones around the world.

The southern hemisphere is gradually becoming a large area of the globe in which nuclear weapons are forbidden, with the Antarctic Treaty, with the full entry into force of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the Treaty of Rarotonga and the recent conclusion of the Treaty establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in Africa, the Treaty of Pelindaba. We therefore encourage and support the establishment of additional nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Ms. Kurokochi (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention from voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47, "Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons".

Japan, which has suffered nuclear attack, earnestly desires that the use of nuclear weapons, which would cause indescribable human suffering, will never be repeated. It thus attaches great importance to the efforts directed towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

Japan considers that in the present international situation, where nuclear weapons do exist, it is more important to achieve steady progress in nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament — for example through the efforts of nuclear-weapon States to take specific nuclear-disarmament measures by further strengthening both the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) regime and its review process and through efforts in accordance with the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, such as, *inter alia*, a ban on all nuclear tests, including the early conclusion of the comprehensive test-ban treaty — than to seek to conclude a convention on the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons, as proposed in document A/C.1/50/L.47.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) *(interpretation from Chinese)*: The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47. China has always advocated the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons. We uphold that view. Pending the achievement of that goal, however, all nuclear-weapon States should undertake unconditionally not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and should give an assurance on the non-use or non-threat of use of such weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States and nuclear-weapon-free zones. They should also undertake to conclude corresponding international and legally binding instruments.

At the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly the Chinese Government proposed that a convention be concluded on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons. On the basis of that principled position, the Chinese delegation has supported the principles and objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.47. The Chinese delegation believes that the portion of the draft resolution devoted to nuclear disarmament and the Draft Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons annexed thereto can be handled in the context of negotiations for a treaty on the total prohibition of nuclear weapons.

We also believe that some of the language in the draft resolution would benefit from further discussion.

The Chairman: Does any other delegation wish to speak at this stage? If not, may we then proceed to cluster 2.

In cluster 2 the Committee has to act upon draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.22: "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". No delegation has been inscribed on the list of speakers either to make a statement or to explain its position on the draft resolution before the vote.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.22 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on those delegations wishing to explain their vote or position.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): The United States wishes briefly to explain its support for draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.22 "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes". We are sympathetic to the main thrust of the draft resolution, which draws attention to, and expresses legitimate concern about, the potential hazards that would result from the irresponsible disposal of nuclear wastes. As we have stated in previous years, however, the United States believes that the First Committee is not the appropriate forum in which to deal with this matter.

Ms. Moules (Australia): Australia was pleased to join consensus once again on the draft resolution on the "Prohibition of the dumping of radioactive wastes".

The purpose of my statement today is simply to draw the attention of the Committee to a recent development of relevance to the topic under consideration in this draft resolution. The Twenty-sixth South Pacific Forum, which took place this past September at Madang, Papua New Guinea, adopted for signature a Convention to Ban the Importation into Forum Island Countries of Hazardous and Radioactive Wastes and to Control the Transboundary Movement and Management of Hazardous Wastes within the South Pacific Region — the Waigani Convention.

Australia, in consultation with other South Pacific Forum countries and with the sponsors of the draft resolution, will be giving consideration to the possibility of including an appropriate reference in next year's draft resolution to the establishment of this important Convention.

The Chairman: Does any other delegation wish to explain its position or vote? There seem to be none.

May we then proceed to take action on a draft resolution contained in cluster 7 — draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.4.

I now call on the representative of the Czech Republic for an explanation of vote or position before the vote.

Mr. Svoboda (Czech Republic): My delegation welcomes the report of the Conference on Disarmament and supports draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.4. We highly appreciate the work carried out during the 1995 session of the Conference on Disarmament by the Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban. We are firmly convinced that negotiations on the text of a comprehensive test-ban treaty will be successfully concluded before the opening of the fifty-first session of the United Nations General Assembly, in the autumn of 1996.

Nevertheless, allow me to make some comments on the course and results of the 1995 session of the Conference on Disarmament. The Czech Republic considers the Conference on Disarmament to be the most important multilateral forum for negotiating and working out international legally binding instruments on arms control and disarmament. The regular functioning and proven mechanisms of the Conference on Disarmament have enabled it to maintain its high standard and prestige, which finally resulted in the conclusion of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction.

At present, however, we notice symptoms of certain crises — let us say, crises of confidence and understanding. A number of the member States of the Conference on Disarmament attach the highest priority to nuclear disarmament, not only because of a fear of the huge arsenals of nuclear weapons but also because of their feeling that the continued existence of a group of nuclear Powers is an expression of hegemony and discrimination. They urge that concrete negotiations on nuclear disarmament and on a ban on the use of nuclear weapons should proceed at a much faster pace than heretofore and they condition their willingness to solve any other urgent matters on progress achieved in the nuclear field.

In our view, three issues are mainly of concern: starting the work of the Ad Hoc Committee on the cut-off; re-establishing the Ad Hoc Committee on transparency in armaments; and the expansion of the membership of the Conference on Disarmament.

The third issue especially is now the focus of our attention inasmuch as the Czech Republic, since the break-up of the former Czechoslovakia, has Observer status only. Besides, we are convinced that the current basis for membership of the Conference on Disarmament does not reflect the reality of the post-cold-war world.

The Czech delegation considers that the linking of problems and the imposition of conditions are counter-productive. They create an atmosphere of mistrust and suspicion and in such a climate the nuclear Powers are unlikely to come to decisions on substantive steps to nuclear disarmament. We are afraid of the fact that a continuing climate of confrontation and mistrust within the Conference on Disarmament could finally lead to the loss of its ability. The international community would then, we believe, have only two choices, either to renounce the efforts of the Conference on Disarmament or to recommend a re-evaluation of its principle of adopting decisions by consensus.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.4, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Morocco in his capacity as President of the Conference on Disarmament.

The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.4 was adopted.

The Chairman: Does any representative wish to speak? There seems to be none.

May we now proceed to cluster 8. There are four drafts in this cluster to be considered now.

I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions before the voting.

Mr. Al Hajaya (Jordan)*(interpretation from Arabic)*: It gives me pleasure to take the floor to explain my country's position regarding draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.11 in cluster 8 concerning the United Nations disarmament fellowship and advisory services programme.

Even though the cold war has ended, the world still needs a universal, common culture that would work in favour of the cause of peace and peaceful coexistence and would promote a sense of security before starting the disarmament process. This is a great and noble task, a significant part of which is performed through the United Nations programme of fellowships. In recognition of the useful contribution made through this programme in preparing young diplomats to serve in the areas of international security and disarmament, particularly the areas of preventive diplomacy and multilateral negotiations, the resolution of disputes by peaceful means, confidence-building measures, and security, Jordan has co-sponsored the draft resolution. In our view, the areas I have just mentioned contribute to the creation of a common language of dialogue and a deeper understanding of the issues of international peace and security, and, by so doing, promote the universal culture that serves the cause of peace.

Many Member States, including Jordan, have benefited from the Programme, thanks to the good management it enjoys under the supervision of its Coordinator, Dr. Ogunsola Ogunbanwo, who exerts unremitting efforts to ensure the Programme's success. Indeed, the Programme has succeeded in making significant achievements and rendering valuable services whose impact will be felt right here in this room.

On behalf of my delegation I call on all delegations to support this draft resolution. I also call for the provision of more financial and other support for the programme because, in the final analysis, that would serve the cause of peace and security throughout the world. My delegation hopes that this draft resolution will be adopted unanimously as in the case of similar draft resolutions in previous years.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): My delegation wishes to co-sponsor draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.11.

The Chairman: Your statement has been noted.

Does any other representative wish to speak? There seem to be none.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft decision in document A/C.1/50/L.2.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I shall now call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on the draft decision in document A/C.1/50/L.2, entitled "Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of vehicles for their delivery in all its aspects". This draft decision was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 15th meeting on Tuesday, 7 November 1995.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Angola, Australia, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated State of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

United States of America

Abstaining:

Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Draft decision A/C.1/50/L.2 was adopted by 102 votes to 1, with 45 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of the Islamic Republic of Iran advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.11, "United Nations disarmament fellowship, training and advisory services". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Algeria, Argentina, Bangladesh, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Cape Verde, China, Cuba, Ethiopia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Mongolia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, the United States of America and Viet Nam.

The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.11 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.16. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.16, "Disarmament Week", was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the 14th meeting of the First Committee on Tuesday, 7 November 1995, and is sponsored by the following countries: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, Costa Rica, Fiji, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.16 was adopted.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26, "Relationship between disarmament and development".

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26 was introduced by the representative of Colombia on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries at the 16th meeting of the First Committee on 8 November 1995 and is sponsored by the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement.

The Chairman: The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of their vote.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel remained in the consensus in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26. However, it would have voted against the fourth preambular paragraph concerning the final documents of the Cartagena Conference if a separate vote had been taken on that paragraph.

Israel is opposed to certain resolutions of that Conference, especially those contained in chapter 87, which single out Israel and do not support the achievements of the peace process in the Middle East.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I speak on draft decision A/C.1/50/L.2 and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26.

Concerning draft decision A/C.1/50/L.2, "Non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and of vehicles for their delivery in all its aspects", the United States has once again voted "No" on this draft decision, with its long and difficult title. Two years ago, the United States voted against General Assembly resolution 48/75 C, upon which the decision which came before us today is based. We voted against that resolution because we believed that the resolution was neither an appropriate nor an effective vehicle for advancing non-proliferation objectives, nor did we support the request in that resolution for a report from the Secretary-General.

In any event, the report was prepared by the Secretary-General last year, and the request for it contained in resolution 48/75 C was thus fulfilled. For some reason, however, the sponsors of that resolution chose to ignore the report and to perpetuate this item on the agenda of the General Assembly without offering any explanation as to their purpose in doing so. Under these circumstances, we could not support this draft decision.

With regard to the relationship between disarmament and development — draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26 — I request that the record of today's proceedings reflect that the United States did not participate in the consensus on that draft resolution, which asserts a relationship between disarmament and development. We believe that disarmament and development are two distinct issues that cannot be considered as organically linked. It was for this reason that the United States did not participate in the 1987 International Conference on this matter. At the same time, my delegation would like to take this opportunity to state again that the United States does not and will not consider itself bound by the declarations in the Final Document of the 1987 International Conference.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): With some hesitation my delegation decided not to break consensus on the draft resolution the Committee has just adopted, the text of which is contained in document A/C.1/50/L.26, on the relationship between disarmament and development.

I should, however, like to make clear the United Kingdom's position on this issue. The United Kingdom has consistently joined consensus on this draft resolution in previous years. However, the draft resolution submitted this year contained a new operative paragraph 2 in addition to the traditional consensus language. In it the international community is urged to devote part of the resources made available by the implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements to economic and social development.

The United Kingdom is committed to reducing expenditure on defence. We already contribute substantial sums to various multilateral aid institutions, in addition to

the aid which we give bilaterally. But there is no simple, automatic link between disarmament and aid. Because of the United Kingdom's procedures for Government accounting, no direct connection can be made between resources made available by the implementation of disarmament and arms limitation agreements and the resources provided for economic and social development.

Operative paragraph 2 is therefore unwelcome to my delegation. We hope it will not be included in any draft resolutions on this subject which may appear in future years.

Mr. Hoffmann (Germany): I too would like to address draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26, and I must go along with the remarks made by my colleague from the United Kingdom.

We have not broken the consensus on this draft resolution. Had the Committee voted on it, my delegation would have abstained because of operative paragraph 2, which in our view is inappropriate. That paragraph claims a peace dividend, whereas we know that, in the first place, disarmament costs money. Our budget procedures cannot show any link between any disarmament dividend that might occur in future years and development or any other kind of aid.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico)(*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation proposed and supported draft decision A/C.1/50/L.2. Our reasons for maintaining this item on the agenda, even with its lengthy but none the less crystal-clear title, were fully stated by my delegation at the 15th meeting on 7 November.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation)(*interpretation from Russian*): In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26, I would point out that the Russian delegation did not object to the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote. However, had there been a vote, we would have been forced to abstain in view of the new element the draft resolution contains as compared to last year's version.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I should merely like to reiterate the fact that Pakistan has strongly supported draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.26 on the relationship between disarmament and development.

In the context of some of the explanations of vote we have heard, I should like to draw attention to the fact that this concept of the link between disarmament and development is a consensus of the General Assembly. For example, it is reflected in paragraph 94 of the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament and, indeed, it was a proposal that was advanced by some of the developed countries as a means to promote the idea of disarmament as a contribution to international development. It is not only a matter of aid, it is a matter of development. We are not looking for hand-outs; we are looking for economic and social development.

The Chairman: I would now propose that the Committee move on to cluster 10, on international security. In that cluster, the Committee will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1, "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 16th meeting of the Committee on 8 November 1995 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon delegations who wish to make statements in explanation of this vote.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1. However, my delegation wishes to state that our position is that all regional-security matters pertaining to the Middle East are subject to the peace negotiations. Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution does not take this into account. Accordingly, we wish to put on record our reservations and to reiterate our position that in the region of the Middle East the establishment of security arrangements, including

in due course a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapon-free zone, is a suitable solution to be agreed upon by all regional States.

Mr. Mubarak (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Over the past few years, my country has been one of the sponsors of the draft resolution on the subject of A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1. However, this year we could not continue to play the same role, even though we joined in the consensus adoption of the draft resolution. Notwithstanding our agreement in the consensus, we continue to have reservations with regard to the sixth preambular paragraph, since my country does not believe that the current arrangements regarding the so-called peace process in the Middle East will lead to a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Palestinian question. In our view, a comprehensive, just and lasting peace lies in the establishment of a democratic non-racial State in Palestine in which Palestinian Arabs and Jews alike would live side by side on an equal footing, on the South African model.

We also have reservations with regard to operative paragraph 9, which has to do with the Barcelona conference. Last year, we accepted the idea of that conference in good faith on the premise that all countries of the region would participate on an equal footing in negotiations regarding security and cooperation in the region. However, our good faith was misplaced. What really happened was that my country was excluded from those negotiations and we were not invited to participate in the preparatory work for the forthcoming conference at Barcelona. Such exclusion of a country that, politically, geographically and economically, has important weight on the southern shores of the Mediterranean, emphasizes our suspicion that what is being prepared for in Barcelona does not aim at promoting security and cooperation in the region but, rather, aims at achieving other purposes, especially the imposition of acceptance of Israel as a principal partner in the negotiations, promotion of acceptance of the results of what is being called negotiations in the Middle East and imposition of the European model with its economic, political and social systems on the countries of the region in order to pave the way for European intervention in these internal affairs of the Mediterranean countries.

Thus the conference is no longer a Mediterranean conference that will be dedicated to the region's security or to the promotion of cooperation between its countries, but a European conference that includes some Mediterranean countries which do not object to the European aforementioned design in the hope of making some material gain which, in my country's view would be made at the cost of surrendering the national sovereignty and independence for which we, in Libya, have paid so dearly.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to express my delegation's reservations with regard to the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.36/Rev.1, "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region".

The Islamic Republic of Iran firmly believes that the so-called Middle East peace process will not lead to full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people nor to the establishment of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region. The same holds true for any other similar references to this subject in the draft resolution.

The Chairman: I thank delegations for their participation in our proceedings. We have exhausted the action portion of today's agenda, and I should like to propose that on Monday afternoon the Committee take action on the following draft resolutions in cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.10, L.15, L.17/Rev.1, L.35/Rev.1, L.44 and L.46.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): We would request that consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15 be deferred until a later date.

Ms. Kurokochi (Japan): I should like to request that action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.1 be deferred to a later date.

The Chairman: In response to those requests, the Committee will defer action on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.15 and A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.1. It is my understanding that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46 is being revised, and it will therefore also be deferred to a later date. We will therefore consider draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.10, A/C.1/50/L.35/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.44 in cluster 1.

In cluster 2, we shall consider draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.1/Rev.1 and L.14.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to request that we defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14 on the chemical weapons Convention.

The Chairman: In cluster 3, the Chair proposes that the Committee take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45.

In cluster 4, the Chair proposes that we take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and L.40.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I should like to request that consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45 be deferred since there may be some amendments to it.

Mr. Moher (Canada): On behalf of a number of countries we had suggested deferment of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.38 and A/C.1/50/L.40, and I would like to maintain that request for a while longer.

The Chairman: The representative of Canada is correct.

In cluster 7, we will consider draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.21/Rev.1, and L.28 and draft decision A/C.1/50/L.51.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): As the Chairman know, consultations are continuing on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28. I would suggest that action not be taken on it on Monday.

The Chairman: May I inquire of the sponsors of draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.24, or any other delegations, whether the Committee would be ready to take action on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.24 and A/C.1/50/L.31? Do I understand that the Committee is prepared to take action on those two draft resolutions?

It is my understanding that some delegations would like to have action on those two draft resolutions deferred to a later date, and the Committee will therefore accede to their wishes.

Let us move now to cluster 8: "Other disarmament measures". The Chair proposes that the Committee take action on Monday on draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.13 and L.48.

In cluster 11, the Committee can take action on Monday on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would request that action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 be deferred.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would ask that action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 in cluster 8, "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", be deferred to a later date.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.